

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/769.420	01/26/2001	Sui Xiong Cai	1735.0440001/RWE/BEC	4240
26111	7590 01/24/2003			
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC			EXAMINER	
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W., SUITE 600 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3934			MCKENZIE,	THOMAS C
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1624	1) -
		DATE MAILED: 01/24/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		<u> </u>				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/769,420	CAI ET AL.				
	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Thomas McKenzie Ph.D.	1624				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 07 January 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the control of the control	ation. A proper reply to a h				
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment.	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension on the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
<ul><li>(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	inally rejected claims.				
NOTE:	·					
$3. \boxtimes$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	on(s): <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment				
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	reconsideration has been consi					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to: <u>39,41,59 and 61</u> .						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>33-38,40,42,43,46,47,51,52,58,60,71 and 76</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10.⊠ Other: <u>PTO-892 attached</u>						

Art Unit: 1624

This action is in response to amendments filed on 1/7/03. Applicants amended claims 33, 42, 43, 46, 47, 58, and 76. Applicants cancelled claims 45, 49, 50, 53-57, 72-75, and 77. In the previous office action objection was made to claims 59 and 61. All other pending claims were rejected. There are twenty-one claims pending and twenty-one under consideration. Claims 58-61 are compound claims. Claim 71 is a composition claim. Claims 33-43, 46, 47, and 76 are use claims. This is the third action on the merits. The application concerns some nicotinamide compounds, compositions, and uses thereof.

## Response to Amendment

Applicants' listing of the diseases they intend to treat overcomes the indefiniteness rejections made in point #5 of the Final-Rejection. Applicants' listing of their intended prodrug compounds overcomes the indefiniteness rejection made in point #6. Applicants' amendments, changing claim 76 to a method claim and the reference to what is substituted, overcomes the indefiniteness rejection made in point #7. Applicants' listing of the diseases they intend to treat also overcomes the enablement rejection made in point #8. Applicants' amendment listing the specific cancers they intend to treat overcomes the enablement rejection made in point b#9. Applicants' deletion of claims 53 and 56 renders moot the enablement rejections made in points #10 and #11. Applicants' cancellation of

Art Unit: 1624

claim 74 and amendment to claim 76 renders moot the written description rejection made in point #14.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 33-38, 40, 42, 43, 46, 47, 51, 52, 58, 60, 71, and 76 remain rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The provisos in the last ten lines of claims 33, 42, 46, the last three lines of claim 34, and the last two lines of claim 58 lack Nowhere in the specification is such a relationship linking the description. description among radicals R<sup>1</sup> through R<sup>11</sup> described. Such a negative limitation requires description. In Ex parte Grasselli, et al. 231 USPQ 393, decided June 30, 1983, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences said: "we agree with the examiner's position of record that the negative limitations recited in the present claims, which did not appear in the specification as filed, introduce new concepts and violate the description requirement of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112." "It might be added that the express exclusion of certain elements implies the permissible inclusion of all other elements not so expressly excluded. This clearly illustrates that such negative limitations do, in fact, introduce new concepts."

Art Unit: 1624

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claim 58 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Setliff (Proc. Arkansas Acad. Sci.) for reasons cited in the previous action. A complete copy of this reference is included with the present action. The compound previously discussed is compound **IVi** in Table 1, page 93.

Claims 58 and 71 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yagihara ('385) for reasons cited in the previous action.

Claims 33, 34, 36, 38, 42, and 46 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gammill ('075). Compound 16 of the reference anticipates Applicants' use claims and fits formula (III) with  $R_6 = R_7 = R_9 = R_{10} = \text{hydrogen}$ ,  $R_1 = R_4 = R_5 = \text{hydrogen}$ , and  $R_2 = R_3 = 4\text{-morpholinyl}$ )-4H-benzopyran-4-on-6-yl. The compound is found in lines 54-55, column 20. Activity against cancer, arthritis, and psoriasis is disclosed in in lines 11-24, column 16.

Claims 33, 36, and 38 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Kubota (WO 99/19303 A1). There is one compound in this reference, which anticipates Applicants' use claims. It is entry 36 on page 36. It and fits formula (III) with  $R_6 = R_7 = R_9 = R_{10} = \text{hydrogen}$ ,  $R_1 = R_2 = R_4 = R_5 = \text{hydrogen}$ , and  $R_3 = 3.5$ -bis(trifluoromethyl)-1H-pyrazol-1-yl. An English traslation of this reference is included with the present action. Activity against

Art Unit: 1624

inflammations and articular rheumatism (rheumatoid arthritis) is taught in the first sentence on page 8 of the translation. See also claims 13 and 14 of the translation.

Claims 33 and 38 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Clemence ('140). There is one compound in this reference, which anticipates Applicants' use claims. The compound was cited previously and fits formula (III) with  $R_6$  = hydroxy,  $R_7$  = trifluoromethyl,  $R_9$  =  $R_{10}$  = phenyl and  $R_1$  =  $R_2$  =  $R_3$  =  $R_4$  =  $R_5$  = hydrogen. It is Example 4, lines 13, column 10 to line 43, column 11. Activity against rheumatoid arthritis is taught in claim 15 of the reference.

Claims 33, 36, 38, 42, and 46 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mantlo ('884). There are over one hundred compounds disclosed in this reference, which anticipate Applicants' use claims. One compound was previously cited and fits formula (III) with  $R_6 = R_7 = R_{10} = R_{10}$  hydrogen,  $R_9 = R_{10} = R_$ 

Art Unit: 1624

Page 6

Applicants' new provisos referred to above, exclude anticipatory compounds. However, the provisos are new matter and the anticipation rejections are maintained.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 39, 41, 59 and 61 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

**TCMcK** 

January 22, 2003

JOHN M. FORD

PRIMARY EXAMINER

ROUP - ART U